



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/414,307	10/06/1999	DAVID W. RITTER	MLNR-07100	3112

28960 7590 04/01/2005

HAVERSTOCK & OWENS LLP  
162 NORTH WOLFE ROAD  
SUNNYVALE, CA 94086

EXAMINER

AN, SHAWN S

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2613

DATE MAILED: 04/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/414,307

Applicant(s)

RITTER ET AL.

Examiner

Shawn S An

Art Unit

2613

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 October 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 and 33-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 26-29 and 33-44 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Remarks*

1. Applicants' arguments with respect to claims 1-25 with the exception of allowed claims 26-29 and 33-44 as filed on 10/18/2004 have been carefully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection incorporating the previously cited prior art references.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-6, 10-15, 18, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' admitted prior art in view of Dischert et al (4,191,971).

**Regarding claims 1, 6, 10, and 15**, Applicants' admitted prior art discloses an apparatus/method for receiving video signals from video cameras, comprising:

a multiplexer (Fig. 1, 108) for selecting a camera video signal from a plurality of video cameras; and

a video decoder coupled to the selector (110) for receiving a selected one of the plurality of video signals.

Applicants' admitted prior art does not particularly disclose a controller coupled to the video decoder for conditioning the video decoder according to a parameter.

However, Dischert et al teaches a system for connecting a plurality of video signals comprising a controller (19 or 219 or 27) coupled to a video decoder (21b or 221b) for conditioning the video decoder according to a parameter (col. 2, lines 1-9).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the relevant art employing apparatus/method for receiving video signals from video cameras as taught by Applicants' admitted prior art to incorporate the conventionally well known concept as taught by Dischert et al so that the controller is coupled to the Applicants' admitted prior art's video decoder for conditioning the video decoder according to a parameter, thereby improving video (display) picture quality.

**Regarding claims 2-3 and 11-12**, Dischert et al discloses a memory device (RAM) for storing parameter in a storage location (col. 3, lines 10-45).

**Regarding claims 4 and 13**, Dischert et al discloses the parameter being a selected one of a plurality of stored parameters (col. 2, lines 46-48).

**Regarding claims 5 and 14**, Dischert et al discloses the parameter being obtained from the video decoder (col. 3, lines 40-41).

**Regarding claim 18**, the Examiner takes official notice that it is well known in the relevant art for such device as a genlock block to perform a horizontal phase of video signal for synchronizing the timing.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the relevant art employing apparatus/method for receiving video signals from video cameras as taught by Applicants' admitted prior art to incorporate the conventionally well known concept of horizontal phase for enhancing quality of the specific needs of the individual camera.

**Regarding claim 22**, Dischert et al discloses gain level for the video signal (col. 2, lines 5-6).

4. Claims 7 and (16-17, 23) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' admitted prior art and Dischert et al as applied to claims 1 and 10 above, respectively, and further in view of Cooper et al (5,870,139).

**Regarding claims 7 and 16**, the combination of Applicants' admitted prior art and Dischert et al does not specifically disclose horizontal frequency of video signal.

However, Cooper et al discloses a horizontal frequency (231b) of video signal.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the relevant art employing apparatus/method for receiving video signals from video cameras as taught by Applicants' admitted prior art to incorporate the conventional camera parameter such as horizontal frequency as taught by Cooper et al for enhancing quality of the specific needs of the individual camera.

**Regarding claim 17**, it is well known in the art for such device as a genlock block to perform a horizontal phase of video signal for synchronizing the timing.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the relevant art employing apparatus/method for receiving video signals from video cameras as taught by Applicants' admitted prior art to incorporate the conventionally well known concept of horizontal phase for enhancing quality of the specific needs of the individual camera.

**Regarding claim 23**, the combination of Applicants' admitted prior art and Dischert et al does not specifically disclose dc clamping of video signal.

However, Cooper et al discloses dc clamping level (250) of video signal.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the relevant art employing apparatus/method for receiving video signals from video cameras as taught by Applicants' admitted prior art to incorporate the conventional camera parameter such as dc clamping as taught by Cooper et al for enhancing quality of the specific needs of the individual camera.

5. Claims 8-9 and 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' admitted prior art and Dischert et al as applied to claims 1 and 10 above, respectively, and further in view of Vincent (5,436,659).

**Regarding claims 8 and 24**, the combination of Dischert et al and Applicants' admitted prior art and Dischert et al fails to disclose the decoder comprising a genlock block.

However, Vincent teaches a conventional genlock block (Fig. 2A, 100) for synchronizing the timing generated by ASIC to an image signal from an external source such as a video camera.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the relevant art employing an apparatus/method for receiving video signals from video cameras as taught by Applicants' admitted prior art to incorporate the conventional concept of genlock block as taught by Vincent for synchronizing the timing generated by an image signal from a video camera.

**Regarding claims 9 and 25**, Vincent discloses ADC (Fig. 1, 24) for converting video signals into a series of digital samples and performing sampling according to pulses received from the timing generator (18).

6. Claims 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' admitted prior art and Dischert et al as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of Holmes (4,167,021).

**Regarding claims 19-21**, the combination of Applicants' admitted prior art and Dischert et al does not specifically disclose chrominance frequency and chrominance phase of the video signal.

However, Holmes teaches conventionally well known chrominance frequency and chrominance phase of the video signal (abs.; Fig. 1, 12) for improving the quality of color video signals.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the relevant art employing an apparatus/method for receiving video signals from video cameras as taught by Applicants' admitted prior art to incorporate the conventional concept of as chrominance frequency and phase of the video signal as taught by Holmes for improving the quality of color of video signals.

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

7. Claims 26-29 and 33-44 allowed.

8. Claims 26-29 and 33-44 comprise the novel features as discussed in the last Official action, wherein the art of record fails to anticipate or make obvious the novel features.

**Conclusion**

9. The prior arts made of record and not relied upon are considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure.
- A) Fairhurst (5,051,827), Television signal encoder/decoder configuration control.
10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to *Shawn S An* whose telephone number is 571-272-7324
11. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.
12. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



**SHAWN AN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER**

3/31/05